

Chernoff's bound forms

M. Grendar, Jr. and M. Grendar

Institute of Measurement Science, Slovak Academy of Sciences (SAS) Dúbravská cesta 9, Bratislava, 842 19, Slovakia & Institute of Mathematics and Informatics of Mathematical Institute SAS and of Matej Bel University, Banská Bystrica, Slovakia. umergren@savba.sk

Abstract. Chernoff's bound binds a tail probability (ie. $\Pr(X \geq a)$, where $a \geq EX$). Assuming that the distribution of X is Q , the logarithm of the bound is known to be equal to the value of relative entropy (or minus Kullback-Leibler distance) for I-projection $\hat{P}$ of Q on a set $\mathcal{H} \triangleq \{P : E_P X = a\}$. Here, Chernoff's bound is related to Maximum Likelihood on exponential form and consequently implications for the notion of complementarity are discussed. Moreover, a novel form of the bound is proposed, which expresses the value of the Chernoff's bound directly in terms of the I-projection (or generalized I-projection).

INTRODUCTION

Originally developed as an asymptotic result for partial sums of random variables, Chernoff's bound [1] was later recognized to be valid 'for any n '. It permitted to formulate Chernoff's bound in the following form

Theorem 1. *Let X be a random variable such that $Ee^{\theta v(X)} < \infty$, for all $\theta \in \mathbf{R}$, where $v(X)$ is a concave, non-decreasing function of X . Let $a \geq EX$, $a \in \mathbf{R}$. Then*

$$\log P(X \geq a) \leq \min_{\theta \in \mathbf{R}} \log Ee^{\theta v(X)} - \theta v(a), \quad (1a)$$

or, equivalently

$$P(X \geq a) \leq \min_{\theta \in \mathbf{R}} \frac{Ee^{\theta v(X)}}{e^{\theta v(a)}} \quad (1b)$$

Since a proof of the Theorem (see for instance [2]) will be used in the sequel, it will be recalled here.

Proof. Since $e^{\theta X}$ is a nonnegative valued and monotone function of X , for $\theta > 0$ it is increasing in X . By assumption $v(X)$ is a non-decreasing function of X . Thus, by Markov's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} P(X \geq a) &= P(\theta X \geq \theta a) = P(\theta v(X) \geq \theta v(a)) = \\ &= P\left(e^{\theta v(X)} \geq e^{\theta v(a)}\right) \leq \frac{Ee^{\theta v(X)}}{e^{\theta v(a)}} \end{aligned}$$

The inequality holds trivially for $\theta = 0$, thus the tightest bound is achieved by minimizing the right-hand side expression, over $\theta \geq 0$.

To show that

$$\arg \min_{\theta \geq 0} \frac{Ee^{\theta v(X)}}{e^{\theta v(a)}} \equiv \arg \min_{\theta \in \mathbf{R}} \frac{Ee^{\theta v(X)}}{e^{\theta v(a)}}$$

apply Jensen's inequality both to the exponential function and to $v(\cdot)$, then recall that $a \geq EX$ and consequently realize, that point of minimum of $Ee^{\theta(v(X)-v(a))}$ should occur for non-negative value of θ .

Hence,

$$P(X \geq a) \leq \min_{\theta \in \mathbf{R}} \frac{Ee^{\theta v(X)}}{e^{\theta v(a)}}$$

□

Notation: Let us denote

$$\hat{\theta} \triangleq \arg \min_{\theta \in \mathbf{R}} \log Ee^{\theta v(X)} - \theta v(a) \quad (2)$$

The entire right-hand side of (1a), (1b) will be denoted $C(a, v(\cdot), \hat{\theta})$, $C^P(a, v(\cdot), \hat{\theta})$, respectively.

While it may appear at first glance surprising, Chernoff's bound on tail probability for a single random variable can be expressed in terms of quantities related to a random sample of asymptotic size. This is recalled and summarized in the next two sections. The last, relatively self-standing section, introduces a novel form/interpretation of Chernoff's bound.

CHERNOFF'S BOUND AS A MINIMUM OF I-DIVERGENCE

In this and the next section it will be assumed that X is either a continuous random variable with pdf

$g(X)$ defined on a support S ; or a discrete random variable with an m -element pmf $\mathbf{q}$.

First, the continuous case. Let $\mathcal{H}$ denote a class of pdf's, $\mathcal{H} \triangleq \{f : E_f v(X) = v(\mathbf{a})\}$. Consider the following *I-divergence minimization task* which consists of selecting a pdf $\hat{f}(X)$ from the class $\mathcal{H}$ that is closest to $g(X)$, where the closeness is measured by I-divergence (or *I-distance*)

$$I(f \parallel g) = E_f \log \frac{f(X)}{g(X)}$$

Employing calculus of variations, it is possible to show (see for instance [3]) that the unique solution (in open form) of the above task is

$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{g(x)e^{\hat{\theta}v(x)}}{\int_S g(x)e^{\hat{\theta}v(x)}} = g(x)e^{\hat{\theta}v(x) - \log E_g e^{\hat{\theta}v(x)}}$$

where $\hat{\theta}$ is a solution of

$$E_{\hat{f}} v(X) = v(\mathbf{a}) \quad (3)$$

Consequently, it can be easily seen that the value of the I-divergence for the pdf $\hat{f}(x)$ closest to $g(x)$ at the class $\mathcal{H}$ is

$$I(\hat{f} \parallel g \mid f \in \mathcal{H}) = \hat{\theta}v(\mathbf{a}) - \log E_g e^{\hat{\theta}v(X)}$$

Recalling the convex analysis duality theorem (see for instance [4]), it can be shown that $\hat{\theta}$ which solves (3) and $\hat{\theta}$ of (2) are the same.

Thus,

$$C(\mathbf{a}, v(\cdot), \hat{\theta}) = -I(\hat{f} \parallel g \mid f \in \mathcal{H}) \quad (4)$$

In words, the logarithm of tail probability of obtaining a value greater than $\mathbf{a}$ is bounded by the negative of the value of the I-distance of pdf $\hat{f}(x)$ closest to $g(x)$ in the class $\mathcal{H}$ of all pdf's with value of $E_f v(X)$ just equal to $v(\mathbf{a})$.

Equivalent to the I-divergence minimization task is a *relative-entropy maximization task* (since relative entropy $H(f \parallel g) \triangleq -I(f \parallel g)$), thus

$$C(\mathbf{a}, v(\cdot), \hat{\theta}) = H(\hat{f} \parallel g \mid f \in \mathcal{H}) \quad (5)$$

The discrete case allows for deeper reading. Let now $\mathcal{H}$ denote a class of pmf's, $\mathcal{H} \triangleq \{\mathbf{p} : E_{\mathbf{p}} v(X) = v(\mathbf{a})\}$. The relative entropy maximization (REM) task

$$\arg \max_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{H}} - \sum_{i=1}^m p_i \log \left(\frac{p_i}{q_i} \right) \quad (6)$$

is solved by $\hat{p}_i = q_i e^{\hat{\theta}v(x_i) - \log E_q e^{\hat{\theta}v(X)}}$, where $\hat{\theta}$ solves $E_{\hat{\mathbf{p}}} v(X) = v(\mathbf{a})$. Consequently, arguing along

the same line as in the continuous case leads to the conclusion similar to (5),

$$C(\mathbf{a}, v(\cdot), \hat{\theta}) = H(\hat{\mathbf{p}} \parallel \mathbf{q} \mid \mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{H}) \quad (7)$$

which can now be followed further to get

$$C^P(\mathbf{a}, v(\cdot), \hat{\theta}) = \prod_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{q_i}{\hat{p}_i} \right)^{\hat{p}_i} \quad (8)$$

Recalling the MaxProb justification of REM (see [5]) it can be noted that $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$ is a limit of sequence of the most probable occurrence vectors; and this way Chernoff's bound becomes related to random sample of asymptotic size.

Example. Let X be defined on support $[1 \ 2 \ 3 \ \dots \ 8]$ with pmf $\mathbf{q} = [0.05 \ 0.4 \ 0.2 \ 0.15 \ 0.10 \ 0.07 \ 0.02 \ 0.01]$. Thus $EX = 3.19$. Setting $\mathbf{a} = 4$ we ask for tail probability $P(X \geq 4)$ which is obviously 0.35. The closest in I-divergence to $\mathbf{q}$ pmf can be found to be $\hat{\mathbf{p}} = [0.0236 \ 0.2526 \ 0.1692 \ 0.1699 \ 0.1517 \ 0.1422 \ 0.0544 \ 0.0364]$. Chernoff's bound calculated by (8) then gives the value 0.8829. For $\mathbf{a} = 5$ it gives 0.5675, as compared to true 0.2; for $\mathbf{a} = 6$ it gives 0.27, (true value is 0.1); and for $\mathbf{a} = 7$ it gives 0.087 (true value is 0.03).

CHERNOFF'S BOUND AND MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD

Let us assume a random sample $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ of size n , such that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(x_i) = v(\mathbf{a})$$

where $\mathbf{a}, v(\cdot)$ are given.

Let the supposed population from which the sample came be of the following exponential form

$$p_i(\theta) = q_i e^{\theta v(x_i) - \log E_q e^{\theta v(X)}}$$

where $\mathbf{q}$ is a pmf, thus $\mathbf{p}$ is the exponentially tilted $\mathbf{q}$.

Maximum likelihood (ML) task lays in searching out a value of θ which is the most likely to generate the sample $\mathbf{x}$. The ML estimator θ_{ML} of θ is known to be the solution of the likelihood equation which is now just

$$v(\mathbf{a}) = \frac{E_q v(X) e^{\theta v(X)}}{E_q e^{\theta v(X)}}$$

Thus, $\hat{\theta}_{ML} \equiv \hat{\theta}$ (see also [3]).

It is then interesting to relate Chernoff's bound to the above ML task. The log-likelihood

$$l(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^m n_i \left(\log q_i + \theta v(x_i) - \log \sum_{i=1}^m q_i e^{\theta v(x_i)} \right)$$

where n_i is occurrence of the i -th element of support at the sample. So,

$$\frac{l(\hat{\theta}_{ML})}{n} = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{n_i}{n} \log q_i - C(a, v(\cdot), \hat{\theta}), \quad (9a)$$

or equivalently, with $L_{\hat{\theta}}$ denoting the likelihood at maximum,

$$C^P(\cdot) = \sqrt[n]{\frac{\prod_{i=1}^m q_i^{n_i}}{L_{\hat{\theta}}}} \quad (9b)$$

which establish ML-Chernoff's bound links.

Do they? For instance (9b), combined with (8), lead to conclusion

$$\prod_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{q_i}{\hat{p}_i} \right)^{\hat{p}_i} = \prod_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{q_i}{\hat{p}_i} \right)^{\frac{n_i}{n}}$$

which is false, except for the case when $\hat{p}_i \equiv \frac{n_i}{n}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, m^1$. This case happens to appear just for the random sample of asymptotic size. Which solves the contradiction: since REM is indeed the method which operates with a random sample of infinite size (c.f. [5], or [6]).

ML and REM tasks are complementary, regardless of sample size (see [3]). But, as the above 'deduction' shows, objective functions of both tasks (maximum likelihood, relative entropy, respectively) attain a compatible relationship only when infinite sample size is assumed. And this is indeed the case, because REM requires assumption about infiniteness of random sample.

At the asymptotic, thanks to a conditional weak law of large numbers (see [6]), Chernoff's bound is linked to the exponential form Maximum Likelihood by

$$\frac{l(\hat{\theta}_{ML})}{n} \xrightarrow{p} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{p}_i \log q_i - C(\cdot)$$

which leads further to the conclusion (similar in spirit to the Asymptotic Equipartition Property)

$$\frac{l(\hat{\theta}_{ML})}{n} \xrightarrow{p} -H(\hat{\mathbf{p}}|\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{H})$$

where $H(\mathbf{p}) \triangleq -\sum p_i \log p_i$ is Shannon's entropy.

NEW FORM OF CHERNOFF'S BOUND

The logarithm of the tail probability $\log \Pr(X \geq a)$ cannot exceed the convex conjugate of the cumulant generating function, of the random variable $v(X)$ — this is a statement of the 'log-Chernoff bound' (recall (1a)), for the log-tail-probability. Assuming that the distribution of X is Q , the value of the log-Chernoff's bound becomes equal to negative of the value of the Kullback-Leibler distance (I-divergence) for I-projection $\hat{P}$ of Q on a set $\mathcal{H} \triangleq \{P : E_P v(X) = v(a)\}$, recall (4). Under the assumption, the Chernoff's bound value can also be expressed directly in terms of I-projection — as will be shown here.

In order to make it relatively self-standing and precise, it will be given in terms of measure theory and I-projection (see [7]). Though the presented variant of Chernoff's bound is the same in the case of a discrete random variable as well as in the case of a continuous one, each case will be discussed under different existence considerations, hence its formulation is separated into separate theorems.

Discrete measure

Theorem 2. *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, Q)$ be a countable probability space and let $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a random variable taking values $\{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$. Let $a \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $a \geq E_Q X$. Assume that $E_Q e^{\theta X} < \infty$ for all $\theta \in \mathbf{R}$. Let $\mathcal{P}$ denote the class of all probability measures on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ and $\mathcal{H} = \{P \in \mathcal{P} : E_P X = a\}$. If a is in the convex hull of $\{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ $\mathcal{H} \neq \emptyset$. Assume this to be the case. Let $\hat{P}$ be the I-projection of Q on $\mathcal{H}$, that is $I(\hat{P}||Q) = \inf_{P \in \mathcal{H}} I(P||Q)$. If $I(\hat{P}||Q)$ is finite, then*

$$Q(\omega : X(\omega) \geq a) \leq \frac{Q(a)}{\hat{P}(a)}$$

Proof. To save space, let $p_i \triangleq P\{x_i\}$, $q_i \triangleq Q\{x_i\}$, $\hat{p}_i \triangleq \hat{P}\{x_i\}$.

By ([4], Thm II.5.2, Thm VIII.3.1), under the assumptions, the I-projection of Q on $\mathcal{H}$ exists, it is unique, and has the following form

$$\hat{p}_i = q_i e^{\hat{\lambda} x_i - \log E_Q e^{\hat{\lambda} X}} \quad (10)$$

where

$$\hat{\lambda} = \arg \min_{\lambda} E_Q e^{\lambda(X-a)} \quad (11)$$

exists and it is unique.

Since $a \geq EX$, $E_Q e^{\theta X} < \infty$ for all $\theta \in \mathbf{R}$, the standard proof of Chernoff's bound (see the Introduction) guarantees that

$$\min_{\theta \in \mathbf{R}} E_Q e^{\theta(X-a)} \geq Q(X \geq a)$$

¹ And except for the trivial case $q_i/\hat{p}_i = 1/m$, for all i

or, with use of (11)

$$E_Q e^{\hat{\lambda}(X-a)} \geq Q(X \geq a) \quad (12)$$

Noting that $\hat{P}(a) = Q(a) e^{\hat{\lambda}a - \log E_Q e^{\hat{\lambda}X}}$ then shows that the LHS of (12) is just $\frac{Q(a)}{\hat{P}(a)}$, which completes the proof. $\square$

Note 1. The claim of Theorem 2 could be directly extended by replacing X by any concave, non-decreasing and bounded function $v(X)$.

Absolutely continuous measure

Let now a measurable function $X: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ induces on $\mathbf{R}$ a law Q dominated by Lebesgue measure λ , so that its density $q(X)$ with respect to λ exists. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a convex set of laws P on $\mathbf{R}$ whose densities $p(X)$ with respect to Lebesgue measure exist. I-projection $\hat{P}$ of Q on $\mathcal{H}$ is then such $\hat{P} \in \mathcal{H}$ that $I(\hat{P}||Q) = \inf_{P \in \mathcal{H}} I(P||Q)$, where $I(P||Q) = \int p(x) \log \frac{p(x)}{q(x)} \lambda(dx)$. There, $0 \log 0 = 0$, $\log \frac{b}{0} = +\infty$ conventions are assumed².

Assuming existence of I-projection, the new form of Chernoff's bound can be stated as follows:

Theorem 3. Let $v(X)$ be a concave and non-decreasing function of X . Let $a \geq E_Q X$, $a \in \mathbf{R}$. Let $\mathcal{H} \triangleq \{p: E_P v(X) = v(a)\}$. Let $\hat{p}(x)$ – the density corresponding to the I-projection of Q on $\mathcal{H}$ – exist. Let $E_Q e^{\theta v(X)} < \infty$, $E_Q v(X) e^{\theta v(X)} < \infty$, for all $\theta \in \mathbf{R}$. Then

$$\mu(\omega: X(\omega) \geq a) \leq \frac{q(a)}{\hat{p}(a)}$$

provided that $q(a) \neq 0$, $\hat{p}(a) \neq 0$ and that a is the point where both $\hat{p}(X)$ and $q(X)$ are unique.

Proof. By Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.1 of [7] I-projection of Q on $\mathcal{H}$ has a density with respect to Lebesgue measure of the following open form $\hat{p}(x, \eta) = e^{\eta v(x) - \log E_Q e^{\eta v(X)}}$, which is closed by $\hat{\eta}$ such that $E_{\hat{P}} v(X) = v(a)$. The density is unique, up to a set $\mathfrak{N}$ of measure zero.

By assumptions $E_Q e^{\theta v(X)} \leq \infty, \forall \theta \in \mathbf{R}$, $E_Q v(X) e^{\theta v(X)} \leq \infty, \forall \theta \in \mathbf{R}$ so $\hat{\theta} \triangleq \arg \min_{\theta \in \mathbf{R}} E_Q e^{\theta(v(X) - v(a))}$ exists and it is unique. The assumptions also guarantee that differentiation of $E_Q e^{\theta(v(X) - v(a))}$ with respect to θ can be

performed under integral (cf. [8], Theorem A(9.1)). Consequently, it can be directly seen that $\hat{\theta}$ solves $E_{\hat{P}} v(X) = v(a)$ and is identical with $\hat{\eta}$.

(The above argument could be also made by invoking ([4], Thm VIII.3.1).)

It is assumed that $\hat{p} \notin \mathfrak{N}$, and different than zero as is also assumed $q(a)$, thus

$$E_Q e^{\hat{\theta}(v(X) - v(a))} = \frac{q(a)}{\hat{p}(a)} \quad (13)$$

The assumption $E_Q e^{\theta v(X)} < \infty, \forall \theta \in \mathbf{R}$ together with assumed properties of $v(\cdot)$ guarantee validity of Chernoff's bound claim:

$$E_Q e^{\hat{\theta}(v(X) - v(a))} \geq \mu(X \geq a) \quad (14)$$

Comparing (13) and (14) completes the proof. $\square$

As far as the existence of I-projection is concerned, Csiszár's work (see [7], discussion on pp. 151, 154 and Theorems 2.1, 3.2) implies that for the case considered above, if $I(P||Q) < \infty$ for some $P \in \mathcal{H}$ and if $\mathcal{H} \neq \emptyset$ and if $v(X)$ is bounded then the I-projection $\hat{P}$ of Q on $\mathcal{H}$ exists, it is unique, and has the form $\hat{p}(x) = q(x) e^{\hat{\theta} v(x) - \log E_Q e^{\hat{\theta} v(X)}}$.

Though the I-projection may not exist in the case of unbounded $v(X)$, nevertheless *generalized I-projection* introduced by Topsøe (see [9]) and studied further by Csiszár (see [10]) exists and take up the exponential form, which – even in this case – permits to formulate Chernoff's bound in terms of generalized I-projection. This will be done after a brief reminder of generalized I-projection, which is adapted from [10].

Let $(S, \mathcal{B})$ be a measurable space, X – random variable, and P, Q be two probability measures defined on the measurable space. I-divergence $I(P||Q)$ between them is

$$I(P||Q) = \begin{cases} \int \log(dP/dQ) dP & \text{if } P \ll Q \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and let $\mathcal{H}$ be a set of probability measures on $(S, \mathcal{B})$. Let

$$I(\mathcal{H}||Q) \triangleq \inf_{P \in \mathcal{H}} I(P||Q)$$

Generalized I-projection $\hat{P}$ of Q on $\mathcal{H}$ is such a probability measure not necessarily in $\mathcal{H}$ that every sequence of probability measures $P_n \in \mathcal{H}$ with $I(P_n||Q) \rightarrow I(\mathcal{H}||Q)$ converges to $\hat{P}$ in variation.

Making use of Csiszár's results, the generalized I-projection form of Chernoff's bound can be stated as follows:

Theorem 4. Let $v(X)$ be a concave, non-decreasing, not necessarily bounded function of X . Let $a \geq E_Q X$,

² The definition of I-projection was adapted from [7]. Throughout the paper $\log$ denotes the natural logarithm (though it is in fact immaterial for the claims which are made).

$\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{R}$. Let $E_Q e^{\theta(v(X)-v(\mathbf{a}))}$ attain its minimum at $\hat{\theta}$. Let $\mathcal{H} \triangleq \{P : E_P v(X) = v(\mathbf{a})\}$. Let $\frac{d\hat{P}}{dQ}(x)$ be the generalized I-projection of Q on $\mathcal{H}$.

Then

$$\Pr(X \geq \mathbf{a}) \leq \frac{1}{\frac{d\hat{P}}{dQ}(\mathbf{a})}$$

provided that unique $\frac{d\hat{P}}{dQ}(\mathbf{a}) \neq 0$.

Proof. Since $\hat{\theta}$ exists (by assumption), by (cf. [10], p. 778) the generalized I-projection of Q on $\mathcal{H}$ is

$$\frac{d\hat{P}}{dQ}(x) = e^{\hat{\theta}v(x) - \log E_Q e^{\hat{\theta}v(x)}} \quad (15)$$

Thus, $1/\frac{d\hat{P}}{dQ}(\mathbf{a})$ is just $E_Q e^{\hat{\theta}(v(X)-v(\mathbf{a}))}$, ie. the Chernoff's bound value, which binds $\Pr(X \geq \mathbf{a})$. $\square$

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Hospitality of Banach Centre of the Institute of Mathematics, Polish Academy of Sciences, where a part of this study was performed as a part of the European Community Center of Excellence programme (package 'Information Theory and its Applications to Physics, Finance and Biology') is gratefully acknowledged. The work was also supported by the grant VEGA 1/7295/20 from the Scientific Grant Agency of the Slovak Republic. It is a pleasure to thank an anonymous reviewer, Chris Williams, František Rublík and Viktor Witkovský for valuable comments which helped to improve both the contents and form of this work.

REFERENCES

1. Chernoff, H., *Ann. Math. Statist.* **23**, 493-507 (1952).
2. Shwartz, A., and Weiss, A., *Large Deviations for Performance Analysis*, Chapman&Hall, London, 1995, pp. 14-15.
3. Grendár, M., Jr., and Grendár, M., "MiniMax Entropy and Maximum Likelihood: Complementarity of Tasks, Identity of Solutions," in *Bayesian Inference and Maximum Entropy Methods in Science and Engineering*, edited by A. Mohammad-Djafari, AIP Conference Proceedings 568, Melville, New York, 2001, pp. 49-61.
4. Ellis, R., *Entropy, Large Deviations and Statistical Mechanics*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1985.
5. Grendár, M., Jr., and Grendár, M., "What is the Question that MaxEnt answers? A Probabilistic Interpretation," in *Bayesian Inference and Maximum Entropy Methods in Science and Engineering*, edited by A. Mohammad-Djafari, AIP

Conference Proceedings 568, Melville, New York, 2001, pp. 83-93.

6. Vasicek, O. A., *Ann. Probab.* **8**, 142-147 (1980).
7. Csiszár, I., *Ann. Probab.* **3**, 146-158 (1975).
8. Durrett, R., *Probability: Theory and Examples*, Duxbury Press, 2-nd ed., 1996.
9. Topsøe, F., *Kybernetika* **15**, 8-27 (1979).
10. Csiszár, I., *Ann. Probab.* **12**, 768-793 (1984).

M. Grendar, Jr. and M. Grendar, "Chernoff's bound forms," in *Bayesian inference and Maximum Entropy methods in Science and Engineering*, edited by Ch. Williams, AIP Conference Proceedings 659, Melville, New York, 2003, pp. 67-72.

to Mar
June 23, 2003